Assure consumer representation at State and Federal utility regulatory proceedings;

Require that utility stockholders, rather than consumers, pay for political, promotional, and institutional advertising;

Establishes a $40 million grant assistance program for State regulatory commissions to improve their staffs and enable them to demonstrate effective rate structures;

Requires State regulatory commissions to institute cost-effective techniques to reduce peak electricity loads, thereby reducing the need for costly new plants;

Requires that the Federal Power Commission develop powerplant reliability standards, and requires utilities to develop quality control plans to increase the reliability of existing powerplants;

Requires filing of advance plans for future powerplant sites.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation is designed to inject some logic into our system of electricity pricing. It will provide some desperately needed relief to low- and middle-income taxpayers. It offers us a means of carefully evaluating our need for construction of new powerplant facilities—construction which places an immense financial burden upon consumers and which contributes to the further deterioration of our environment. It will put an end to pricing schemes which unfairly discriminate against residential customers and obstruct our efforts to conserve energy.

I urge my colleagues to support this measure.

ANTITRUST PARENS PATRIAE ACT

SPEECH OF

HON. ELIZABETH HOLTZMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 18, 1976

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 8532) to amend the Clayton Act to permit State attorneys general to bring certain antitrust actions, and for other purposes.

Ms. HOLTZMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of H.R. 8532, the Antitrust Parens Patriae Act.

The purpose of this bill is to make the antitrust laws effective for the typical consumer. Under its provisions, a State attorney general will be able to sue an antitrust violator for damages on behalf of the residents of the State. Thus, individuals who have suffered losses—because of violation of the antitrust laws, will be compensated for those losses.

Although H.R. 8532 does not expand the coverage of the antitrust laws, it makes their sanctions far more effective. At the present time, a large corporation which violates the antitrust laws generally need fear only a suit by a damaged competitor or by the Federal Government.

Under this bill, 50 State attorneys general will be empowered to investigate and bring actions for antitrust violations. In addition, damages, since they involve payments on behalf of thousands, perhaps, millions of consumers, should be severe enough to deter most antitrust violators. The net effect should be increased competition, greater freedom in the marketplace, and lower prices to consumers.

H.R. 8532 is, however, not as useful a remedy for consumers as it might have been, for it denies State attorneys general the authority to retail private counsel on a contingency fee basis to prosecute antitrust cases. Antitrust law is extremely complex. Because prior to this bill, States had little occasion to bring antitrust suits, few if any of the offices of State attorneys general have developed antitrust expertise.

The most sensible answer to this problem is to allow States to retain private attorneys, experienced in antitrust law, to prosecute antitrust parens patriae cases for a contingency fee. If the State wins, the court awards a reasonable attorney's fee which the violating corporation must pay. If the State loses, it does not have to pay a substantial legal fee. Because this arrangement offers the greatest benefit to consumers at the least risk to the State, I regret that Representative FLOWERS' amendment to allow contingency fees in parens patriae cases was defeated.

The defeat of the Flowers amendment was all the more disturbing because its only serious defect could have been remedied by an amendment which I was prepared to offer. In debate, a number of Members expressed the concern that allowing a State attorney general to retain private counsel for a contingency fee provided an easy opportunity for political patronage. The concern was that an attorney might be retained to prosecute a lucrative antitrust case in return for political services or contributions.

I believe this is a legitimate concern. We should not allow the very important power to bring antitrust suits to be turned into a device for political payoffs. Had the Flowers amendment passed, therefore, I would have offered an amendment to deny the payment of a fee to an attorney selected for political reasons.

The text of my amendment follows:

Sec. 4H. No attorney's fee may be awarded in an action brought under section 4C to or on behalf of any person who is not a salaried employee of the State and is employed or retained to bring such an action on account of such person's making or promising to make a contribution of a thing of value (including services) for the benefit of any candidate or any political party.

This amendment would have prevented the antitrust parens patriae power from being misused, and it would have assured the consumer of high quality legal representation.

I am hopeful that when the Senate considers H.R. 8532, it will add both the Flowers amendment to allow the use of contingency fee arrangements, and my amendment to prevent their misuse.

U.S. INTELLIGENCE

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 29, 1976

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

[From the San Diego Union, Mar. 21, 1976]

U.S. INTELLIGENCE AT THE CROSSROADS: SECRET CANNOT BE KEPT

(By Lt. Gen. Daniel O. Graham)

No intelligence officer, civilian or military, can view with equanimity the damage done in the past year to U.S. intelligence.

Congressional investigations, sensational media treatment and "insider" exposes have combined to paint U.S. intelligence agencies as generally evil and sinister, at best inept and often ridiculous.

The damage done is enormous, though hard to quantify publicly. Were intelligence agencies to try, they would only compound the damage. If they enumerate sources lost, they will lose more; if they spell out serious morale problems, morale will erode even further.

The morale problem is serious. Men and women, civilian and military, who have proudly devoted a large part of their lives to the intelligence profession, are faced with a barrage of accusations against themselves and their superiors which paint them as fools, if not the agents of utter wickedness.

The intelligence "heroes" on the current scene are those who break their oaths and for profit, ego, or even vengeance, vilify their embattled former colleagues.

Disillusionment, frustration and bitterness are common among intelligence professionals.

Senator Frank Church and Representative Otis Pike, meanwhile, have made pious speeches about the continuing need for intelligence, but they seem unable to resist the urge to defame intelligence people—and endanger their lives—if it seems politically acceptable to do so.

Senator Church insisted on publishing his committee's findings on alleged CIA assassination attempts despite the strong and cogent pleas of William Colby that the naming of large numbers of CIA men and their contacts would put their lives and well-being in jeopardy— a warning that came tragically true in Greece, where a CIA man was assassinated. Church could have published only the findings without all the masses of detail containing the names of the men involved. What purpose was served by this exposure?

Well, the basic findings were pretty dull reading. CIA, it turns out, never assassinated anyone. The closest they ever got was providing the means to anti-Castro Cubans.

But the suggestive details of the testimony given were much more likely to titillate the press than were the bare findings.

There is little doubt that such behavior on the part of the congressional committees has had a deleterious effect on intelligence, but to be fair about it, it must be said that we were having very serious trouble even before the congressional investigations. They were, after all, a trailer to the Watergate affair.

The previous association of members of the "plumbers" with CIA was an irresistible lure to congressional investigators. The fact that the Watergate investigation revealed remarkable resistance on the part of CIA to pressures from the White House staff and that General Vernon A. Walters, CIA Deputy Director, offered his head on a platter rather

badly-needed jobs in these difficult economic times. However, with the situation being what it is, company managers cannot afford to take any chances, so hiring and promotion programs are being altered to fit the existing circumstances.

Evidence that reverse discrimination is becomingly increasingly prevalent can be found as some of the victims begin to fight back. Just recently, the New York State Division of Human Rights overturned the appointment of a female high school principal from Puerto Rico and ordered her replaced by a white New Yorker on the grounds that the latter was far better qualified.

Likewise, the New York Supreme Court recently ruled in favor of seven white men who claimed they were better qualified than three Hispanics who had been hired previously by the Suffolk County, N.Y., Police Department.

Along the same lines, the Virginia State Legislature, in response to a controversial Fairfax County, Va., policy of hiring minority group members for their police force in order to reach a certain quota, nearly passed a bill outlawing the use of quota hiring systems.

The fear of reprisals is evident in a very recent example from the school system in New York City, where 79 school principals have refused to release ethnic data about their staffs and pupils. The State education department claims that the information is necessary for a "survey" of the ethnic backgrounds of school staffs and the city board of education's pupil census. The school principals' union opposes the survey and the release of the data, arguing that the data could, and probably will, be used to set up ethnic quotas for supervisory positions.

The 1964 Civil Rights Act made it clear that there should not be any discrimination on the basis of race, creed, color or national origin; yet, now we have an agency created by that same act, the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, pressuring employers to hire and promote people on that very basis. The power and influence of this Commission is evidenced by the above examples.

Many in today's America argue that "society"—not the individual—is responsible for all actions. They also argue that the goal of the body politic is the achievement of "equality"—not the traditional idea of equal opportunity, but the opposite notion of equality of condition. The American heritage has traditionally been that of personal liberty—and the heavy burden of work which accompanies such liberty—that gave the ordinary American the freedom and incentive to excel. The American dream and ideal remains the creation of a society in which each man and woman, regardless of race, religion, or ethnic origin, can go as far as his or her ability will provide. The entire notion of quotas, whether the old-fashioned quotas which excluded minority group members, or the current variety which provides them with special privileges, is in opposition to that tradition and to that dream.

America, during this Bicentennial Year, must remember the principles of individuality and freedom which have brought it to its current greatness and must not turn its back upon these ideals in an effort to create a society in which groups, and not individuals, have rights. If America is to do so, the entire dream of a free and open society will have been defeated.

ELECTRIC UTILITY RATE REFORM AND REGULATORY IMPROVEMENT ACT

HON. THOMAS J. DOWNEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 29, 1976

Mr. DOWNEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I am today joining with my distinguished colleague. Representative JOHN D. DINGELL, in the introduction of the Electric Utility Rate Reform and Regulatory Improvement Act.

This legislation would revise the manner in which electricity is priced to residential, commercial, and industrial customers. It has been introduced in an effort to assure that supplies of electric power in the future will be adequate, reliable and above all reasonably priced. Its purpose is to minimize energy consumption, to minimize the need for new generating capacity and to provide for reasonable rates to consumers. In addition, this bill seeks to increase efficiency in the electric industry by encouraging competition, prescribing reliability standards and establishing regional planning mechanisms.

There are few issues of more vital concern to my constituents than the continuing upward spiral of electricity prices. The Long Island Lighting Co. this year applied to the New York State Public Service Commission for a 15.6-percent rate hike in 1976. If approved, the hike will increase the typical customer's bill by nearly 10 percent in the winter, and by more than 25 percent in the summer. This action came shortly after the company had been granted a 21-percent increase.

The situation is typical. In 1974, more than 200 rate increases totaling more than $2.2 billion were granted nationally. This was double the 1973 totals. More than 100 additional rate increase requests are currently pending in State utility commissions, totaling more than $4 billion.

The burden of these increases, not surprisingly, has fallen hardest upon those least able to afford it. The rate increases have operated like a regressive tax, punishing those of low- and moderate-income most severely.

A. PEAKLOAD PRICING

One of the most significant problems addressed by this bill is the current system of peakload pricing. Utility rates typically decline with increasing usage and provide discounts for heavily consuming markets. The inevitable result of these promotional rates is to stimulate demand, especially peak demand. Projected increases in demand lead to plans for new construction, which require still more rate increases. Moreover, because powerplants must be built to meet peak demand, not average demand they have been forced to acquire a great deal of excess capacity. Last year about 51 percent of the Nation's electric generating capacity was idle.

By reducing peaks, rather than encouraging them, we can continue to meet consumption needs without bleeding the consumers dry. We must require those customers, and I mean all of those customers, who produce peak loads to pay the cost of meeting them. We must abolish promotional and discount rates. The Federal Energy Administration has estimated that by 1985 as much as $120 billion in new generating capacity construction could be avoided by such cost-of-service pricing.

Title II of this bill would require that electric rates reflect costs of service to each customer. Under the bill, methods of determining costs of service must be based on marginal costs during daily and seasonal time of use. Declining block rate under this legislation are prohibited, unless specifically justified by declining costs of service.

B. "LIFETIME" QUANTITIES OF ELECTRICITY

Residential customers of a utility are entitled to a rate for a "subsistence quantity" of electricity—that are determined to be necessary for lighting and refrigeration—equal to the lowest rate which the utility charges any other retail customer. This bill would provide this needed relief to residential customers.

Under the bill, States are permitted to enlarge the end uses to which their lowest rates apply, or adopt some alternative means—such as energy stamps—for alleviating the burden on low- and moderate-income consumers of high electricity costs.

C. THE FUEL ADJUSTMENT CLAUSE

During 1974, more than $4.6 billion in extra utility fuel charges were passed along to the Nation's electricity consumers through fuel adjustment clauses. These clauses have enabled utilities to gain automatic increases in circumvention of normal procedures and have encouraged wasteful spending by those utilities, who know that they can pass along all of these expenses to the consumer.

Under this bill, increased fuel expenses and other expenses may be passed on to consumers without formal ratemaking proceeding only to the extent that such expenses have increased by more than 5 percent, and then only 85 percent of the excess may be passed on. Moreover, the bill requires utilities to shop for the cheapest price and provides for an annual audit of such expenditures.

D. CONSTRUCTION WORK IN PROGRESS

Under this bill, construction work in progress will be excluded from the rate base until all of the requirements of title II have been met; at that time, inclusion of two-thirds of those costs is authorized. The bill will not affect facilities currently under construction.

E. OTHER PROVISIONS

Among the other provisions in the bill are sections which:

than involve the Agency, never seemed to sink in.

Another woe had begun to beset the intelligence community well before the Watergate circus. This was the breakdown of self-discipline in government and press on security matters. It had become exceedingly difficult for the U.S. government to keep a secret.

For decades the government had relied for security of state secrets on a sort of honor system in the legislative and executive branches of government. Bureaucrats entrusted with sensitive classified information guarded it out of a sense of duty.

All this changed in the late sixties and early seventies.

The rise of the anti-establishment syndrome stripped away the tacit restraints which had made the system work. Government and ex-government people lost all compunction to guard a secret if blabbing it to the press offered personal, bureaucratic or political advantage.

Some individuals actually reversed the old feelings of obligation to keep secrets and felt themselves duty bound to reveal them out of a sense of superior morality; Daniel Ellsberg and the famous Pentagon Papers was a case in point.

Of course, not all the blame for damage done to the intelligence community from the breakdown of security can be laid at the feet of the press.

Too many bureaucrats have slapped "Secret" and "Top Secret" labels on matters which do not deserve such protection. The labels go on simply because the office or bureaucrat concerned does not want the matter to be too well known. Some of it is sheer administrative sloppiness or laziness.

Documents remain classified long after the need to protect "sources and methods" has passed. Intelligence agencies are particularly reluctant to put out papers with no classification stamp on them.

One wag at CIA said that the only unclassified papers put out at Langley were the paychecks and they would be classified if a secret bank could be set up to cash them. It is hard to convince a newsman that he should respect a classification stamp if he has seen it too often on trivia.

Another complicating factor in the leak problem is the tendency of some key officials to try to manipulate the press by passing selected tidbits to favorite newsmen. Given the nature of the relationship of press to government in this country, it is doubtful that this practice will ever cease completely, and sometimes the deliberate disclosure of intelligence information (not sources) to the public is a positive good. The problem is that the practice can easily get out of control.

It happened recently with a series of leaks and counterleaks about Soviet compliance with arms control agreements. Further, while leaks of information by a top official are generally protective of intelligence sources, they cause some newsmen to look up their less discreet contacts to find out what the intelligence sources were. A news item mentioning "satellites," or "communications intercepts" always has a bit more credence and much more pizzazz. The code word of the intelligence operation involved really adds luster.

Both babbling bureaucracy and irresponsible press share the blame for the hemorrhage of leaks in the public media which have done grave damage to intelligence.

But the solution is not to determine who killed Cock Robin; the solution is to make the laws of the land protecting its intelligence sources enforceable, and then enforce them. Until this is done, the United States will remain a powerful giant, gradually going blind for lack of intelligence information.

After all the smoke of sensationalism and political posturing is cleared away, one or two matters still emerge which suggest a need for reorganization. For example, the lines of responsibility for one type of intelligence activity—covert action in support of foreign policy—are too hazy.

It is hard to trace responsibility upward from the CIA to national authority. However, it should be abundantly clear that the intelligence agencies did not undertake the operations criticized by the committees on their own initiative. The finger of responsibility points at those in ultimate power over national security affairs.

The Church Committee's report on alleged assassination attempts, despite carefully obscure treatment of presidential responsibility, cannot exonerate presidents and their key political advisers—even those who were the political allies if not heroes of the report's drafters.

If, as Senator Church has stated, assassination of a foreign leader such as Fidel Castro is "utterly alien" to the American way, was it President John F. Kennedy who was acting in an "utterly alien" fashion, or some lesser figure in CIA? The notion that the CIA would decide to assassinate the Cuban dictator and keep the White House in the dark about it is preposterous.

The danger which Congress uncovered, then, was not that of a "rogue elephant" CIA unilaterally perpetrating wickedness; it was of a fuzzy chain of responsibility for intelligence actions.

Much of the hurrah coming out of congressional inquiry and the public media has to do with the techniques of intelligence. There is much pious tongue clucking about the CIA's use of journalists and businessmen in intelligence work, affiliation with and financial support to oversea churchmen and missionaries, planting false stories in the foreign press, and so on, it seems ad infinitum.

Today there seems to be no better peg for a news item than exposition of some new allgation of wickedness on the part of CIA. Much of this neo-piety on the part of the press is sheer hypocrisy. U.S. intelligence agents cannot function effectively using the Guide Book for Girl Scouts as an operating manual.

One hears and reads a lot of inane arguments involving demands to continue or abolish certain intelligence techniques on the basis of similarity to KGB practices. It makes no more sense to demand the outlawing of an intelligence practice because the KGB uses it than it does to demand that all practices allowable to the KGB should be allowed to U.S. intelligence agencies.

The thing to bear in mind about the KGB (and its counterparts in other Communist countries) is that it represents the opposing team in a deadly serious game which the United States can forfeit only at great peril to free men everywhere in the world.

The KGB prides itself on operating under the frankest of amoral codes, the creed of the Chekist. Absolutely anything goes—sex, bribery, blackmail, terror, torture, and murder are to the KGB legitimate tools of the trade.

No responsible U.S. intelligence officer has ever advocated operating under the KGB rules. But it is insane to believe that U.S. intelligence can have the slightest success against such an adversary if bound by Marquis of Queensbury rules.

U.S. intelligence operatives have the enormously difficult problem of doing a job which is rarely possible within the normal American definition of "fair play." In clandestine activity "fair play" could quickly result in the death of agents.

Now, there are good reasons for organizational change in the U.S. intelligence apparatus quite independent of the congressional inquiries. These reasons were scarcely illuminated by the Committees, but are at least as important as the need to correct or forestall alleged "abuses."

The U.S. intelligence structure has needed some overhaul for several years, mainly because the shifting world situation has changed U.S. intelligence needs, technological advances have changed the way intelligence does it job, and certain aspects of the "centralization" of intelligence have proved unworkable.

The U.S. intelligence community today remains structured and postured basically to deal with the relatively simple bipolar world of the fifties and sixties when the prime intelligence question was: What are the military capabilities and intentions of the Soviet Union?

But today's world is not so simple and the answers to questions such as "What are the prospects for the Soviet harvest?", "Can Argentine technology support a nuclear weapons program?", What are the Arabs doing with oil revenues?", "Will the French sell helicopters to Iran?" have become vital to U.S. interests.

In other words, political and economic intelligence on a wide variety of target countries has become critical to good national decision-making.

In the tactical field, the nature of the intelligence requirement has also changed over the past several years. Once the essential intelligence needs for a U.S. commander were "strength, capability, and disposition" of the enemy forces. With this intelligence he could prepare for tomorrow's, next week's, or next year's battle.

Today he must be prepared for a devastating and critical first battle at all times.

This means he needs much more timely and precisely detailed intelligence in potential enemy forces. He is now opposed by modern military technology, especially powerful long-range weaponry which must be monitored constantly.

In any war between forces employing such weapons, defeat or victory can be determined in a matter of hours, perhaps minutes. There is no time to crank up the commander's intelligence apparatus after the start of hostilities. What this means with regard to reorganization schemes is that the needs of the forces in the field and fleets at sea, including their needs for intelligence support from national systems, must not be ignored in the enthusiasm for centralization.

If we are not careful, we will diminish the war-fighting and deterrent capabilities of U.S. arms by concentrating too narrowly on the needs of Washington-level intelligence users.

The next month or so, as Congress and the White House wrestle with problems of U.S. intelligence organization and rules of conduct, will be crucial to the Nation, and to the future of the Free World as a whole.

Reformers must reform only that which must be reformed; reorganizers must reorganize only that which must be reorganized.

A combination of puritanical zeal, cynical political partisanship, and bureaucratic power plays can complete the already well-advanced destruction of America's eyes and ears—its intelligence service.

If restoration of U.S. intelligence effectiveness is indeed what motivates the reformers, they must face up to the hard problem of protecting U.S. state secrets, rather than the easy one of creating new congressional committees.

Legislation is required which recognizes the right of the United States government to have a secret and which provides practical means to apply criminal sanctions to those persons entrusted with secrets who abuse their trust. This means that the public

media must not remain immune from responsibility for publication of national secrets and from protecting the insider who has provided the information and violated his trust.

Within the executive branch, the emphasis in providing better intelligence organization and oversight of intelligence activities should be based in the realities of the changed world situation, the new technology of intelligence, and the long-standing problems of community coordination—not on the sensational stories arising from the recent congressional inquiries.

If we are careful, the viability of U.S. intelligence can be retained and much of the damage done repaired; if we are not careful, we can so weaken U.S. intelligence that our country will resemble a blind giant groping its way through the dangers of the next decade.

TRIBUTE PAID TO CORNELIUS HARNETT IN WILMINGTON, N.C.

HON. CHARLES ROSE III

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 29, 1976

Mr. ROSE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to recognize an effort made by my constituents, Leslie N. Boney, Jr., FAIA, Mrs. F. P. Fensel, and the Rev. Robert Cook, and by our distinguished majority leader, THOMAS P. O'NEILL, Jr., to replace the grave marker at St. James Episcopal Church in Wilmington, N.C., for Cornelius Harnett, member of the 1777 Continental Congress and early patriot leader.

Born in 1723, Mr. Harnett moved to Wilmington in 1727 and became involved in revolutionary activities in 1765. It is said of him that from 1765 to 1781 there was scarcely any movement in the cause in which he did not bear a conspicuous part. He was not a soldier; rather he channeled his efforts into public service.

On February 21, 1776, he appeared before Governor Tryon at Brunswick and demanded that the stamp officer and other clerks of the county courts take an oath to never issue any stamped paper in the province. It was done.

By 1775, Cornelius Harnett was chairman of the Provincial Council, and when the British forces occupied the Wilmington area, he was marked as a fugitive and an object of British punishment.

HARNETT CAPTURED

In 1781, British Lord Cornwallis marched to Wilmington. The arrest of Cornelius Harnett was a chief aim of the British and during an attempt to escape, Harnett was captured and returned to Wilmington where he was jailed in a roofless blockhouse. He died the day after Cornwallis left town in 1781.

He had requested a simple burial at St. James' Church and he had chosen his own epitaph, two lines from Alexander Pope:

> Slave to no sect, he took no private road,
> But looked through Nature up to Nature's God.

Several years ago, the St. James vestry decided to improve their old graveyard. One of their activities included repairing the Harnett gravestone which had been damaged over the years. However, a fire in the stone company's warehouse where the repairs were being made cracked and delaminated the markers. Searches for matching stones were made by Mrs. F. P. Fensel and Mrs. W. G. Broadfoot of the church's committee and Leslie N. Boney, Jr., a Wilmington architect.

After repeated failures to find a suitable stone, they discovered that a Massachusetts' quarry had supplied the original material. Yet, the local Eastlong Meadow, Mass. marble contractor informed them that the material was not available from the defunct quarry, unless special provision was made by the local government.

MAJORITY LEADER AIDS PROJECT

At this point the majority leader and I were asked to assist in the acquisition of a suitable stone, and within a few days of our first discussion, the problem was solved. Some of the stone from the quarry had been saved and was immediately available in a stone contractor's shop in Newark, N.J. Rubbings were made of the cracked originals and new markers were cut and carved by Robert Young & Sons, Inc., in Newark.

The rededication ceremony was held on February 21, 1976, with the Rev. Robert Cook presiding. The gravemarker is 22½ inches wide and 66 inches high, and 3 inches thick. The top has a cusp-like shape above 2 arcs. The main surfaces have a fine sand finish and the edges are shot sawn cut.

Mr. Speaker, this effort of the citizens of North Carolina and of Massachusetts reaffirm the spirit of cooperation and collaboration evident during the early days of our country. Cornelius Harnett fought and died for the opportunities we have shared to replace his gravemarker. I salute his high standards and the perpetuation of those standards by those involved in this notable project.

BOSTON AFFIRMATIONS

HON. ROBERT W. EDGAR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 29, 1976

Mr. EDGAR. Mr. Speaker, as both a Congressman and a United Methodist Minister, I am often called upon to reconcile the alleged inconsistencies of serving God while concurrently participating in the political process. I do not feel that there are any inconsistencies, Mr. Speaker. I believe that I have directed my votes in a manner consonant with the great ideals of the Judeo-Christian tradition.

Recently, a statement entitled "Boston Affirmations" came to my attention. The statement is the result of a collaboration of a group of theologians, pastors and laity organized by the Boston Industrial Mission. It places social action in a theological perspective, a frame of reference which is helpful to me in expressing my role in Congress.

Its poetic beauty is an inspiration to me and I hope that it will be to my colleagues. I welcome comments on this statement, and I insert it to be printed here:

THE BOSTON AFFIRMATIONS

The living God is active in current struggles to bring a Reign of Justice, Righteousness, Love and Peace. The Judeo-Christian traditions are pertinent to the dilemmas of our world. All believers are called to preach the good news to the poor, to proclaim release to the captives and recovery of sight to the blind, to set at liberty those who are oppressed and to proclaim the acceptable year of the Lord. Yet we are concerned about what we discern to be present trends in our churches, in religious thought, and in our society. We see struggles in every arena of human life, but in too many parts of the church and theology we find retreat from these struggles. Still, we are not without hope nor warrants for our hope. Hopeful participation in these struggles is at once action in faith, the primary occasion for personal spiritual growth, the development of viable structures for the common life, and the vocation of the people of God. To sustain such participation, we have searched the past and the present to find the signs of God's future and of ours. Thus, we make the following Affirmations:

Creation: God brings into being all resources, all life, all genuine meanings.

Humanity is of one source and is not ultimately governed by nature or history, by the fabric of societies or the depths of the self, by knowledge or belief. God's triune activity sustains creative order, evokes personal identity and is embodied in the dynamic movements of human history in an ever more inclusive community of persons responsibly engaged in all aspects of the ecosphere, history, and thought.

Fall: Humanity is estranged from the source of life.

We try to ignore or transcend the source and end of life. Or we try to place God in a transcendent realm divorced from life. Thereby we give license to domination, indulgence, pretence, triviality, and evasion. We endanger and we corrupt inspirited communities. We endanger creative order, we destroy personal identity, allow tyranny, anarchy, and death to dominate the gift of life.

Exodus and Covenant: God delivers from oppression and chaos. God chooses strangers, servants and outcasts to be witnesses and to become a community of righteousness and mercy.

Beyond domination and conflict God hears the cry of the oppressed and works vindication for all. God forms "nobodies" into a people of "somebodies" and makes known the laws of life. The liberation experience calls forth celebrative response, demands responsibility in community, and opens people and nations for a common global history.

Prophecy: In compassion God speaks to the human community through prophets.

Those who authentically represent God have interpreted—and will interpret—the activity of God in social history. They announce the presence of God in the midst of political and economic life; they foretell the judgment and hope that are implicit in the loyalties and practices of the common life; and they set forth the vision of covenantal renewal.

Wisdom: The cultural insights and memories of many peoples and ages illuminate the human condition.

The experience and lore of all cultures and groups bear within them values that are of wider meaning. Racism, genocide, imperialism, sexism are thus contrary to God's purposes and impoverish us all. Yet all wisdom must also be tested for its capacity to reveal the human dependence on the source of life, to grasp the depths of sin, to liberate, to evoke prophecy, and to form genuine covenant.

The New Covenant: God is known to us in

ROUTING AND RECORD SHEET

SUBJECT: (Optional)

Executive Registry
76-1732

FROM:
Legislative Counsel
7D35 Hqs.

EXTENSION | NO.

DATE 31 March 1976

STATOTHR

TO: (Officer designation, room number, and building)	DATE RECEIVED	DATE FORWARDED	OFFICER'S INITIALS	COMMENTS (Number each comment to show from whom to whom. Draw a line across column after each comment.)
1. Director				Attached is a recent news-paper article by General Daniel Graham that was inserted in the 29 March Congressional Record, which you might be interested in reading. The article sets forth the General's personal views on secrecy and the intelligence business, and the desirability of tightening the organization of the intelligence community. STATINTL
2.				
3.				
4.				
5.				
6.				
7.				
8.				
9.				
10.				
11.				
12.				
13.				
14.				
15.				

George L. Cary
Legislative Counsel

OLC

Executive Registry
Room 7-E-12
Headquarters